
To: Planning_Commissioners
Subject: Additional Materials Received

Additional Materials Received
Planning Commission September 20, 2012

ITEM NO. 1.b: Minutes of September 6, 2012

ITEM NO. 2: Bristol Chevron Service Station (PA2012-073)

ITEM NO. 3 Davidson-Took Variance (PA2012-108)

-----Original Message-----

From: Wisneski, Brenda
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 3:55 PM
To: Whelan, Melinda; Murillo, Jaime; Ramirez, Gregg; Garciamay, Ruby
Cc: Brandt, Kim
Subject: FW: Written comments on September 20, 2012 Planning Commission agenda items

Mosher comments below for review and distribution.

-----Original Message-----

From: Houston, Rob
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 3:44 PM
To: Wisneski, Brenda; Brandt, Kim
Subject: FW: Written comments on September 20, 2012 Planning Commission agenda items

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Mosher [mailto:jimmosher@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 3:42 PM
To: Houston, Rob
Subject: Written comments on September 20, 2012 Planning Commission agenda items

In reviewing the staff reports for the September 20, 2012 Planning Commission meeting, I have the following comments and possible corrections:

ITEM NO. 1b MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2012

On page 5 of 6, under "ITEM NO. 5 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT": "uptown Newport project" should be "Uptown Newport project".

Item 2 (Bristol Chevron Service Station (PA2012-073))

General comments:

* The description of the existing facility as having "six dispensers" might be slightly misleading. I believe the existing station has three islands, each of which has two two-sided dispensing stations, as well as separate diesel dispensers on two of the islands. That would suggest something like 14 to 16 vehicles (I don't recall if the diesel dispensers are two-sided) could be fueling at one time.

* The long-established, if somewhat seedy, "Minute King" convenience/liquor store on the Irvine Avenue property immediately abutting the service station on the south might call into question the need for the proposed new convenience store, which might possibly result in an over-concentration of opportunities for alcohol sales to motorists.

Starting on page 12 of the 104 page PDF:

* In Condition of Approval 15, the reference to "per condition of approval LIGHTING, No.2" is unclear. Is this supposed to be a reference Condition 14? Or is it a reference to some other City document?

* In Condition 16, I suspect "adequate SITE distance" is supposed to be "adequate SIGHT distance."

* The relevance of Condition 25 to Alcohol Sales (the topic under which it is found) is not immediately obvious. Isn't this really a fire/safety issue? And does the condition refer to exits from the building? or from the property?

* In Condition 31, "under the control of the license" is probably meant to be "under the control of the LICENSEE"?

* In Condition 38, "CalGree Section 5.701" should probably be CalGreen Section 5.701" (missing "n")

* In Condition 46, "knox box" is probably meant to be "Knox box".

* In Condition 48, "along the Bristol Street Irvine Avenue frontages" is probably meant to be "along the Bristol Street AND Irvine Avenue frontages" (as in Condition 47).

* In Condition 49, "full depth AC patchback" could well be correct, but I don't know what "AC" stands for.

* In Condition 57, "closed driveway shall replaced by" should be "closed driveway shall BE replaced by".

* In Condition 61(b), "30 minutes" seems a very long time for trucks and heavy equipment to be idling.

Item 3 (3 Davidson-Took Variance (PA2012-108))

General comments:

* It is unclear from the report what the name "Davidson-Took" signifies.

* The report also does not make immediately clear that additional City Council approval will be needed for the requested driveway access to Park Avenue (Condition of Approval 10).

* Is the 3-foot rear setback, which could in places be reduced to 2.5 feet (per Condition of Approval 7), adequate for fire access?

Starting on page 16 of the 31 page PDF:

* In Statement 2, "and construction of a" should be "and construct a". Alternatively, "to demolish an" could be "demolition of an".

* In Required Findings D-2, "that is consist with" should be "that is consistent with".

* In F-2, "Utilizing FAR as more equitable development limit" should be "Utilizing FAR as A more equitable development limit" and "other swellings in the vicinity" should be "other DWELLINGS in the vicinity"

Yours,

Jim Mosher